

or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not be based on Applicants' disclosure (MPEP § 2142).

As the Examiner noted in the Office Action, Ohashi fails to disclose sensing the temperature of the electronic device and causing the fluid to move when the threshold temperature is detected. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine Ohashi with Moulene to remedy the defects that the Examiner noted with Ohashi.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Moulene with Ohashi. Moulene teaches, "The invention concerns a temperature conditioning support for thermal tests on small objects such as semi-conductor wafers incorporating integrated circuits." (Moulene, Abstract, lines 1-3.)

Moulene also teaches a thermostat function when electrical resistance 16 (to generate heat) is formed on the inner face of the platen 1b by depositing a thin layer of metal. The temperature can be detected by the thermometric probe, which triggers the injection of cooling fluid into the support 1 so that the temperature of the internal face of the platen 1b rapidly decreases. (Moulene, col. 5, lines 20-53.) Moulene does not teach triggering the injection of a cooling fluid when the silicon wafer or an electronic device generates heat, but triggers the injection of cooling fluid when heating resistance 16 generates excess heat.

Since the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-25, 27-28, and 30.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7, 17, 26, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi in view of Moulene as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Mizuno (U.S. Patent No. 5,333,676) ("Mizuno"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mizuno does not remedy the defects of Ohashi as discussed above. Specifically, Mizuno does not teach or suggest the desirability of sensing the temperature of the electronic device and causing the fluid to move when the threshold temperature is detected. In addition, there is no motivation or suggestion to combine Mizuno with Ohashi to remedy the defects of Ohashi.

Since the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to Claims 7, 17, 26, and 29.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (a) are in proper form, (b) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied-upon art of record, and (c) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the Application forward to allowance, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 11/20/02


William E. Hickman, Reg. No. 46,771

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited as First Class Mail with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on Nov. 20, 2002.


Nedy Calderon

11/20/02
Date